



Alberta Cancer
Board

Butting In

Tobacco Control Update

from the Division of Population Health and Information

"Excuse me, but here's something that might interest you..."

Volume 2, Number 6, November 2004

ISSN: 1705-8635

Ad designed to "poison" health warnings

This 1969 newspaper ad, which ran in the United States five years after the Surgeon General connected tobacco to lung cancer, pokes fun at public health authorities' warnings about the dangers of smoking. The ad compares historical beliefs that tomatoes were poisonous to warnings about tobacco:

100 years ago the tomato was considered "poison"

In the 19th Century the tomato was considered poisonous ... children were warned to enjoy its beauty but not to taste it. Today we know the tomato is not only delicious but an excellent source of vitamins A and C.

Now we are being told that tobacco is poison. The propaganda mills grind out dire warnings based on "research." These warnings simply ignore other bodies of research which flatly state "no proved link" between tobacco and diseases of the lungs and heart. Several independent health agencies use the tobacco scare to raise huge sums of money.

There is good reason to think that within a few years we will look back and laugh about "the great tobacco scare of the 1960s." In the meantime, there is a vicious, unfair attempt to destroy a great American agricultural industry, affecting the livelihood of millions of people.

Think about it!

Source: Anne Landman, Globalink
<http://tobaccodocuments.org/landman/201008816.html>

Health groups to intervene

The Supreme Court of Canada has granted the Canadian Cancer Society, Canadian Lung Association, the Canadian Medical Association and the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada a say in Rothmans, Benson & Hedges vs. Saskatchewan's Tobacco Control Act case tentatively scheduled for January 18, 2005.


Similar intervener status has been granted to the Western Convenience Stores Association.

Both groups must file written arguments, but their requests to present oral arguments were deferred to a date following the "receipt and consideration of the written arguments," the Supreme Court said.

Intervener status allows both groups to argue the case before the Supreme Court, but they are not allowed to offer new evidence or raise new issues.

Saskatchewan's legislation made it illegal to have point-of-purchase displays in March 2002.

Saskatchewan's legislation made it illegal to have point-of-purchase displays (also known as "power walls") in March 2002. In September 2002, the Court of Queen's Bench denied the Toronto-based tobacco company's constitutional challenge. But, the following year, the decision was overturned by the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/buttingintobacco26albe>

Rothmans, Benson & Hedges said the legislation violated the charter of rights by denying the company freedom of expression. It also claims the Act goes against federal legislation that allows retailers to use signage to indicate that tobacco products are available.

The Appeal Court agreed that the ban on retail displays conflicted with the federal Tobacco Act and was therefore “inoperative”. The province has subsequently appealed to the Supreme Court.

Source: Saskatoon Star Phoenix

URL: <http://www.canada.com/saskatoon/starphoenix/news/local/story.html?id=c3890acd-9d49-45a6-91ff-ca4dccb9544a>

CORPORATE CORNER

Tobacco industry puts “sand in the gears”

American tobacco industry representatives referred to delaying implementation of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) report that led to smoke-free indoor air requirements as putting “sand in the gears”.

According to a Mayo Clinic report overviewed in the April 2004 issue of the “American Journal of Preventive Medicine” by Mary Lawson and John Murphy, researchers showed “for the first time how the tobacco industry attempted to mobilize political pressure on the EPA to delay or stop it from issuing its 1992 risk assessment on environmental tobacco smoke.”

The EPA assessment concluded that “second-hand smoke was a Group A human carcinogen and had adverse effects on respiratory health, particularly in children.”

Previously secret tobacco industry documents “show the tobacco industry will expend whatever effort is necessary to protect itself from public health policy

that would adversely affect cigarette consumption,” said Dr. Richard Hurt, director of the Mayo Clinic Nicotine Dependence Center, and an author of the report.

Tactics included lobbying the first Bush Administration to impose new risk assessment standards for federal agencies, which would delay the release of the EPA report, and urging that Administration to transfer jurisdiction over environmental tobacco smoke from the EPA to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, which would have squelched the report.

“the tobacco industry will expend whatever effort is necessary to protect itself”

- Mayo Clinic report

These efforts were largely unsuccessful, the report stated, but eventually the tobacco industry sued the EPA in federal court to nullify the risk assessment as it related to lung cancer.

The proceedings took seven years, successfully delaying the EPA risk assessment and casting a cloud over its validity, before the U.S. 4th Circuit Court of Appeals overturned the tobacco industry’s suit, the authors reported.

Ironically, the EPA report and its highly publicized release served to speed up the initiation of smoke-free public places laws in numerous cities, states, provinces and even entire countries.

Source: Mayo Clinic report in the April, 2004, “American Journal of Preventive Medicine”

Butting In is published bimonthly by the Alberta Cancer Board to provide current information about tobacco. Articles are based on evidence published in leading scientific journals and newspapers and taken from the pages of the tobacco industry’s own documents. Sources of information for all articles are noted at the end of each piece. Articles may be reproduced with attribution to the Alberta Cancer Board and the original source as cited. Forward comments to the Division of Population Health and Information at (403) 355-3270 or prevention@cancerboard.ab.ca.

Library and Archives Canada
Bibliothèque et Archives Canada



3 3286 53173555 9